

Message

From: Donovan, Betsy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1075D24015DB49549A456BC334BD9C25-DONOVAN, BETSY]
Sent: 2/26/2019 6:09:36 PM
To: Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]; Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]; Kaur, Supinderjit [Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Yes. As I recall, DOI acknowledged that the passive recreator scenario would be equivalent to the trespasser scenario that was used in the HHRA. We have changed the FS language to state they are equivalent throughout. I think this was included in their latest FS comments/FS redline/transmittal email (or somewhere in the their voluminous communications). I will try to find the comment.

From: Vaughn, Stephanie
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Kaur, Supinderjit <Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think now, at least somewhat based on FWS comments, we are saying the trespasser scenario also represents the passive recreator scenario. So we are evaluating risks to people who may, say, hike through the site or go bird watching, 84 days a year.

Right?

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 12:18 PM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Kaur, Supinderjit <Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov>; Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: rolling knolls question

I asked Tanya about FWS involvement with the HHRA, since this was before my time as RPM. Her response is below. Should we ask CDM if they know of any FWS comments?

From: Mitchell, Tanya
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Hi Betsy,

If I remember correctly, USFWS was involved with the site very early on during my project management. The MESA was prepared in 2007, which was before my time on the site. It does not look like USFWS was involved or reviewed the document but, no records to say otherwise.

During the development of the HHRA, I do not recall USFWS having a risk assessor to review the document. I could not find any comments from USFWS on the HHRA and I believe they only reviewed the BERA.

I copied Michael because he was the risk assessor for the HHRA and in case I missed something.

Thanks,

Tanya

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 8:38 AM
To: Mitchell, Tanya <Mitchell.Tanya@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Thanks, I appreciate your help on this!

From: Mitchell, Tanya
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 7:26 AM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Morning,

Give me some time to go back and think about this. I'll let you know what I recall later today.

Thanks,

Tanya

From: Donovan, Betsy
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 6:12 PM
To: Mitchell, Tanya <Mitchell.Tanya@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: rolling knolls question

Hi Tanya, ORC is reviewing the PRPs responses to FWS comments on the FS – attached. Please see Sarah's message below regarding the HHRA... Did DOI/FWS review the HHRA? Did DOI/FWS object to our decision not to include passive recreationalists (hikers) in the HHRA? Thank you!

From: Fajardo, Juan
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:40 PM
To: Flanagan, Sarah <Flanagan.Sarah@epa.gov>; Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: rolling knolls question

Betsy, what do you say?

From: Flanagan, Sarah
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 4:37 PM
To: Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>
Subject: rolling knolls question

Ex. 5 Attorney Work Product (AWP)